## REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-21 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected all claims.

The Examiner indicated in his previous Office Action that claims 1, 20 and 21 as filed would be allowable if amended to include the features of claim 13. Applicants therefore amended claims 1, 20 and 21 in Amendment A to incorporate claim 13. In the current Office Action, however, the Examiner has indicated that he is no longer prepared to allow the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 20 and 21 under 35 USC 102(b) over the Chakrabarti reference, "Automatic resource compilation by analyzing hyperlink structure and associated text." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

> A computer-implemented method for searching a large
> number of hypertext documents in accordance with a current
> search query, comprising:
>> determining which of the hypertext documents are expert
>> documents;
>> ranking the expert documents in accordance with the
>> current search query by:
>>> determining a level score for each of the expert
>>> documents;
>>> determining a fullness factor for each key
>>> phrase on each of the expert documents; and
>>> determining an expert score for each expert
>>> document in accordance with the level score

8

> of the expert document and the fullness
> factors for the key phrases of the expert
> document;
>
> ranking target documents pointed to by the ranked expert
> documents; and
>
> returning a results list based on the ranked target
> documents.

The claimed invention describes a method for searching a large number of hypertext documents in accordance with a query. The claimed invention determines expert documents and ranks the expert documents in accordance with the current search query. Ranking of the expert documents is performed by determining an expert score in accordance with a level score for the expert document and a fullness factor for each key phrase of the expert document. Then the target documents of the ranked expert documents are ranked to determine a search result set. Ranking the expert documents in accordance with the current search query is advantageous because, for example, it insures that expert documents being considered are on the query topic.

Claim 20 discloses an apparatus for performing similar steps. Claim 21 recites a computer readable medium having a computer program product for directing a computer to perform the steps recited in claim 1.

Chakrabarti does not teach, suggest, or disclose the claimed invention. For example, Chakrabarti does not teach, disclose or suggest the step of "ranking the expert documents in accordance with the current search query,"as claimed. The Examiner cites page 3, line 10 of Chakrabarti for the disclosure of

this step. The cited portion of the reference and the surrounding lines disclose that a hub score (a score of the expert page) is determined based on the authority scores of documents pointed to by the hub (page 3, lines 10-13). For example, if the hub page contains links to pages A and B, the hub score h(p) of the hub page is a sum of the authority scores of page A, a(A), and page B, a(B). Thus, the hub score in Chakrabarti is determined solely based on the authority score of the documents pointed to by the hub, but not in accordance with the search query, as claimed. Thus, Chakrabarti does not teach, suggest, or disclose the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Chakrabarti. Independent claims 20 and 21 are also patentable over Chakrabarti for at least the same reason.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) over Chakrabarti in view of Yu.

Claim 11 recites:

> The computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein determining which of the hypertext documents are expert documents includes:
> determining a document having at least a predetermined number of outlinks to be an expert document if the document also points to at least the predetermined number of targets on distinct non-affiliated hosts.

Thus, the claimed invention, as recited in claim 11, determines an expert document as a document having at least a predetermined number of outlinks. This method advantageously restricts the selection of expert documents (hubs)

10

to a subset of pages by removing those pages that will not lead to resources on a specific query topic.

The Examiner cited page 3, lines 1-2 of Chakrabarti for the disclosure of claim 11. The cited portions of the reference, however, define a hub page as a page "that contains a large number of links to pages containing information about the topic." Thus, while Chakrabarti regards all documents with outgoing links as "hubs", the claimed invention restricts the selection of expert documents to a subset of pages. Therefore, Chakrabarti does not disclose or suggest the step of "determining a document having at least a predetermined number of outlinks to be an expert document...", as claimed. Thus, Chakrabarti does not teach, suggest, or disclose the features of claim 11, and claim 11 is patentable over Chakrabarti.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-12 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakrabarti in various combination with Yu and Page. Because claims 2-10, 12 and 19 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, they derive patentability from the independent claim from which they depend, in addition to reciting their own patentable features. Therefore, claims 2-10, 12 and 19 are patentable over the cited references.

In light of these Remarks, the Examiner is asked to issue a Notice of Allowance allowing all claims now pending, claims 1-12 and 14-21.

11

If any issues remain outstanding prior to allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney so that they may be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
Krishna Asur Bharat, George Andrei
Mihaila

Date: ___12/26/02___          By:_____
                              Rimma Budnitskaya, Reg. No. 48,237
                              FENWICK & WEST LLP
                              Silicon Valley Center
                              801 California Street
                              Mountain View, CA 94041
                              Tel: (415) 875-2401
                              Fax: (415) 281-1350

12